UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,704	05/23/2001	Lakshmi Arunachalam	002435.P002X	1786

24341 7590 09/08/2006

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP.
2 PALO ALTO SQUARE
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER	
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/863,704	ARUNACHALAM, LAKSHMI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,17-25 and 27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,17-25 and 27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/6/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed on June 6, 2006.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed June 6, 2006, has been received and considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 22 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 22 recites "the networked objects comprise a plurality of geographically distributed objects including object-oriented software objects", and claim 23 recites "the networked objects allow access to at least one of the plurality of geographically distributed objects". This is confusing to the examiner, as the examiner feels a person reading claim 23 after claim 22 would believe the network objects actually do not comprise a plurality of geographically distributed objects including object-oriented software objects since they allow access to at least one of the plurality of geographically distributed objects. In order for examiner to advance prosecution, examiner has interpreted "networked objects" as best understood. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues:

a) Page does not disclose or suggest multiple service providers associated with a single transaction.

b) Page does not disclose or suggest networked objects.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions.

5. With regards to a), examiner directs applicants attention to Page, col. 49, line 52-col. 50, line 9. In this passage Page explains features of Fig. 7G (cited in previous actions). Specifically, Page discloses running multiple servers (i.e. service providers) in parallel in an Online Transaction Processing (OLTP) environment in order to process a single transaction from a client. Examiner thus maintains Page indeed suggests and discloses multiple service providers associated with a single transaction.

6. With regards to b), examiner maintains applicants claimed "networked objects" are not clearly defined in the claims. Thus, examiner further maintains Page at least inherently discloses applicants claimed networked objects where Page teaches an object interface that supports three modes of ***inter-object communication*** (col. 3, lines 31-48).

7. Furthermore, as mentioned in previous actions, examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the examiner's position that applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior

art. Failure for applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the applicant in the response and reiterated the need for applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the Examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-14, 17, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Page et al. (hereinafter Page), U.S. Patent 5,329,619.

10. In considering claims 1 and 7, Page teaches a method and machine-readable medium comprising: receiving a request for a transaction involving a plurality of service providers, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8); associating a plurality of networked objects with the transaction, (col. 3, lines 31-48); fulfilling the transaction by communicating with the plurality of service providers, (col.

49, line 52-col. 50, line 2); and routing information associated with the transaction to the plurality of networked objects, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

11. In considering claims 2 and 8, Page further teaches the transaction including communicating with a virtual information store to determine a network address for at least one of the plurality of networked objects, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

12. In considering claims 3 and 9, Page further teaches the transaction including using at least one networked object to enable a transactional application that is associated with the transaction, (col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

13. In considering claim 4, Page teaches interacting with a networked object of a first service provider and a networked object of a second provider, (col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

14. In considering claim 5, Page teaches using the networked object in real-time, (col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

15. In considering claims 6 and 10, Page teaches an interactive transaction among the plurality of service providers, (col. 49, line 52-col. 50, line 2, col. 52, lines 46-52).

16. In considering claim 11, Page teaches a method comprising: receiving a request for a transaction involving a plurality of service providers on a service network, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8); registering with an object router configured to route information associated with the transaction, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8); associating a plurality of networked objects with the transaction, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8); using at least one networked object to enable a transactional application that is associated with the transaction, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8); and receiving the transaction results, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8).

17. In considering claim 12, Page teaches using a virtual information store that contains an object identity and a network address assigned to each networked object, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

18. In considering claim 13, it is inherent in the teachings of Page that the virtual information store includes using a distributed on-line service information base (DOLSIB), (col. 3, lines 55-61).

19. In considering claim 14, it is inherent in the teachings of Page that the networked object is accessed using its network address, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

20. In considering claim 17, Page teaches the transaction includes services, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62).

21. In considering claim 27, Page teaches selectively routing to and involving the service providers in the transaction, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 18- 25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page.

24. In considering claim 18, Page teaches a system comprising: an interface of network transaction portal to a client network access device to receive a request for a transaction from the access device, (col. 3, lines 36-42, col. 49, lines 52-62, also see Fig.'s 6, 7g, and 8); and a transactional application of the network transaction portal corresponding to the transaction, the transactional application functionally interposed

between the client network access device and a plurality of service providers corresponding to the transaction to access to and remotely execute methods associated with networked objects associated with the service providers, (col. 3, lines 31-48, col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

Although the teachings of Page show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the network transaction portal controlling the transaction.

Nevertheless, Page does show: the network transaction portal managing the transaction, (col. 3, lines 42-45). Page also shows a client choosing the option of having control being passed back from a network transaction portal, depending on the clients preference in processing, (col. 9, line 34, through col. 10, line 18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Page, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Page to show controlling the transaction from the network transaction portal. This would have further facilitated service transactions in a network involving a plurality of service providers, Page, col. 3, lines 20-28.

25. In considering claim 19, Page further teaches the transactional application is configured to use a DOLSIB to route to a plurality of networked objects, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

26. In considering claim 20, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that a switch in an application layer of a layered network communications model switches to the transactional application after receiving the request, (col. 3, lines 36-48).

27. In considering claim 21, Page teaches a networked object associated with the transaction functionally interposed between the network transaction portal and an enterprise computer system of a service provider participant to interface with the enterprise computer system and utilize data of the enterprise computer system, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

28. In considering claim 22, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that the networked objects comprise a plurality of geographically distributed objects including object-oriented software objects, (col. 3, lines 31-36, col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

29. In considering claim 23, Page teaches the networked objects allow access to at least one of the plurality of geographically distributed objects, (col. 3, lines 31-36, col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

30. In considering claim 24, Page teaches a system comprising: a server to store software and to execute software instructions, a network transaction portal, a service involving a plurality of service providers, and routing a plurality of objects associated

with the plurality of service providers by routing information associated with the transaction to a plurality of networked objects associated with the plurality of service providers (col. 3, lines 31-48, col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

Although the teachings of Page show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the network transaction portal controlling the transaction.

Nevertheless, Page does show: the network transaction portal managing the transaction, (col. 3, lines 42-45). Page also shows a client choosing the option of having control being passed back from a network transaction portal, depending on the clients preference in processing, (col. 9, line 34, through col. 10, line 18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Page, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the ad to modify the teachings of Page to show controlling the transaction from the network transaction portal. This would have further facilitated service transactions in a network involving a plurality of service providers, (Page, col. 3, lines 20-28).

31. In considering claim 25, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that the network transaction portal means includes a network application, (col. 3, lines 42-48, col. 14, lines 30-65, col. 49, line 52- col. 50, line 2, also see Fig. 7G).

Conclusion

32. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is 571-272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HP/
8/25/06

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100